

---

**APPLIES TO:** All academic departments' programs

**ISSUED:** November 30, 2021

**KEYWORDS:** program, review, periodic

**EFFECTIVE:** November 30, 2021

---

**PURPOSE:**

The purpose of the Periodic Program Review (PPR) process is multi-faceted:

- Report on the status of the program (i.e., congruence with and ties to the institutional mission, efficient use of resources, curriculum appropriateness, outcomes meeting/exceeding benchmarks, faculty research and awards, etc.)
- Prepare the program for the future by informing strategic directions and changes to improve the academic program and student success
- Meet the requirements of the institutional and, in certain cases, programmatic accreditors

**DEFINITION OF TERMS IN THIS POLICY:**

1. **Programmatic accreditor:** an accrediting agency that protects the interests of the public and the respective profession by defining the standards for education and evaluation within professional educational programs to ensure their compliance with those standards (e.g., ACEN, ACOTE, ARC-PA, CAAHEP, CoARC, JRCERT, etc.)
2. **External consultant ('consultant')**: A discipline-specific consultant with teaching experience and is a subject matter expert in the discipline specific to the program being reviewed. They can provide feedback about the curriculum, sequencing, and other aspects of program. In addition, they can and should critique drafts of the program's self-study report.

**POLICY DETAILS:**

The PPR process should:

- Be based on existing and iterative self-assessment processes (i.e., those used by programs to meet the standards/criteria set by their respective accrediting bodies)
- Represent the input of all program stakeholders (i.e., students, faculty, staff, advisory board, etc.)
- Be concise in addressing the criteria outlined below and leverage existing reporting (i.e., self-study reports developed to meet programmatic accrediting standards/criterion)
- Focus on improving teaching and learning of faculty and students
- Produce findings and recommendations, based on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis for the program, that can be addressed by the program, department, and/or institution
- Encourage accountability of the program in implementing continuous improvement

**PROCEDURE**

Programs requiring programmatic accreditation must complete a self-study periodically based on programmatic accreditation standards and guidelines, though timelines vary based on programs' accreditors and previous performance.

When the program is completing the self-study required for re-accreditation, the institution, in consultation with the program director, may provide support in identifying and hiring of a consultant to review and evaluate the self-study and the program. The consultant will submit to the college a report summarizing the program's strengths and opportunities for improvement, including suggested timeframes for the achievement of these improvements.

Once the report is completed by the consultant a copy will be submitted to the:

- department chair (and program director, if different)
- respective academic dean, and
- institution's Assessment and Accreditation Committee (AAC).

The program will present an update to the AAC and respective academic leader on the progress being made toward the opportunities for improvement provided in the consultant's program report or identified in the programmatic accreditor's response to program submissions, on an annual basis.

Self-study reports submitted to, and any actions taken by, the programmatic accreditor will be shared with the institution's AAC.

**RESOURCES/REFERENCES:**

Related KHN Policy: N/A

Maintained by: Office of the Academic Dean

**HISTORY OF REVISION:**

Original date: 11/30/2021

Revision dates: N/A